

## R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 3 and 5-8 currently remain in the application. Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled. Claims 1, 5 and 6 are herein amended.

Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 in Paragraph 5 in page 3 of the Official Letter. Applicant believes that there is no ambiguity for the following reasons and hence respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection. Although the Examiner refers to the expression "program" appearing both at lines 1 and 7 of claim 1 when considering the same expression appearing in line 8, this expression when appearing at line 1 is merely describing a general scope of the claim in its preamble section, while the same expression when appearing at line 7 is used as a specific inventive element that is being stored in the program memory which is one of the constituents comprising the subject matter of the claimed invention. Besides, when the same expression ("program") appears in line 8, this expression does not stand alone but is expressed as "said program stored in said program memory". Thus, the Examiner's interpretation at lines 9-10 of Paragraph 5 of the Official Letter is correct, and it is believed that no amendment to Claim 1 is necessary in order to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Eldridge. At least in part in view of the Examiner's reasons for the rejection, Claim 1 is herein amended not only by incorporating the limitations in Claim 2 but also by adding two wherein-clauses to further limit its scope, Claims 2 and 4 being canceled at the same time. Briefly stated, these additional limitations are supported, for example, by the portion of the specification from line 27 of page 9 to line 23 of page 10, as well as Figs. 8-11, and relate to the changes in the display when a function block is selected from the left-hand side of the figures. The characteristics described by these additional limitations are not disclosed or even hinted at by Eldridge and hence their incorporation into Claim 1 is believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

Independent Claims 5 and 6 are herein amended along similar lines and hence amended Claims 5 and 6 are also believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

The dependent claims which now depend from these amended independent claims should be automatically deemed allowable.

It is therefore believed that the instant Amendment is totally responsive to the Office Action and that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP  
/kn/

Keiichi Nishimura  
Registration No. 29,093

December 30, 2008  
500 12th Street, Suite 200  
Oakland, California 94607  
Telephone: (510) 663-1100  
Telefax: (510) 663-0920